

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-29 are pending.

Claims 1-15, 18-20 and 24-29 are rejected.

Claims 3, 16-17 and 21-23 are objected to.

II. After Final Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 3, 11 and 16 have been amended to more particularly point out what the Applicants' consider to be their invention. The claim amendments do not require an additional search as the amended subject matter contains elements considered to be allowable by the Office. Claims 1, 3, 11 and 16 are fully supported by the specification. Applicants' respectfully request entry of the amendments to advance the application to allowance.

III. Claim Objections

Claim 3 has been objected to for being an improper dependent claim for failing to further limit the claim. Claim 3 has been amended to more particularly point out what the Applicants' consider to be their invention.

Claims 16, 17 and 21-23 are objected to for depending upon a rejected base claim. The contents of claim 16 have

been added to claim 1 and therefore claim 16 and 17 are allowable because they depend upon an allowable base claim. Claims 21-23 are allowable because they depend upon an allowable base claim because the cited prior art does not teach all of the limitations of base claim 18.

IV. IDS TIMELY SUBMITTED BUT NOT PROPERLY CONSIDERED

Applicants originally submitted an IDS on March 19, 2004, one month before the mailing of the April 19 Office action made final. The IDS was resubmitted on May 3, 2004 and stamped received by the Office on June 14, 2004. The Applicants expect to receive as required by the MPEP the PTO 1449 sheet with all references considered because it was timely submitted along with either a notice of allowance or new office action.

V. Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cardorniga et al. (USPN 5,415,937) in view of Shaw et al. (USPN 4,142,727) and Molitor (USPN 4,726,590).

The rejection is moot in light of the Applicants amendment to claim 1 adding the limitations regarding a

first radius of about 0.5 to 0.9 inches and a second radius of about 0.9 to 1.3 inches not taught by the prior art contained in claim 16 that was indicated to be patentable. The Cardorniga et al. '937 patent is silent regarding the use of a dual radius dimple. The Shaw '727 patent is also silent regarding the use of dual radius dimples. The Molitor '590 patent also fails to address this limitation. Absent any disclosure with respect to the properties of the dual radius dimples, the combination of the Cardorniga '937, Shaw '727 and Molitor '590 patents fails to teach each and every limitation of amended claims 1-7. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment of claim 1 and reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-7.

Claims 8-10 and 12-15 are rejected as being unpatentable over Cardorniga et al. (USPN 5,415,937) in view of Shaw et al. (USPN 4,142,727) and Molitor (USPN 4,726,590) further in view of Shaw (USPN 4,877,252). The rejection is moot in light of the amendments to claim 1 and claims 8-10 and 12-15, which depend upon amended claim 1.

As discussed above the Cardorniga et al. '937 patent is silent regarding the claimed dual radius dimples. Furthermore, the Shaw '727 patent is also silent regarding the above-mentioned dual radius dimple properties. The

Shaw '252 patent is also silent regarding the properties of the dimples. The Molitor '590 patent similarly is silent regarding the properties of the dimples.

Therefore amended claims 8-10 and 12-15 are allowable over the combination of the Cardorniga '937 patent, the Shaw '727 patent, the Shaw '252 patent and the Molitor '590 patent, all of which fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' ball with the claimed dual radius dimple properties. Applicants' respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the obviousness rejection of claims 8-10 and 12-15.

Claim 11 is rejected as being unpatentable over Cardorniga et al. (USPN 5,415,937) in view of Shaw et al. (USPN 4,142,727), Molitor (USPN 4,726,590), Shaw (USPN 4,877,252) further in view of Cardorniga (USPN 5,470,076). The rejection is moot in light of the amendments to claim 1 because claim 11 ultimately depends upon amended claim 1. The addition of the Cardorniga '076 patent does not address the Applicants' claimed dual radius dimple properties. The combination of cited references does not teach each and every limitation of claim 11 with respect to dual radius dimple properties. In light of the amendment to claim 1

Applicants' respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the obviousness rejection of claim 11.

Claims 18-20 are rejected as being unpatentable over Cardorniga et al. (USPN 5,415,937) in view of Shaw et al. (USPN 4,142,727) and Molitor (USPN 4,726,590) further in view of Shaw (USPN 4,877,252). The Applicants' traverse this rejection as improper for failing to teach each and every limitation as admitted by the Office.

The Cardorniga '937 patent as correctly described by the Office teaches the use of a high modulus polymer having 20-25% by weight of methacrylic acid. The Applicants' claims are directed toward an ionomer having an acid level of 19%. Therefore, the cited combination of patents fails to teach each and every feature of the Applicants' claimed invention. The Cardorniga '937, Shaw '727, Molitor '590 and Shaw '252 patent fails to teach the use of a high modulus ionomer having 19% by weight of Methacrylic acid as claimed by the Applicants. The Applicants' respectfully request reconsideration of claims 18-20 as the combination fails to teach the Applicants' claimed cover properties.

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected as being unpatentable over Cardorniga et al. (USPN 5,415,937) in view of Shaw et al. (USPN 4,142,727) and Molitor (USPN 4,726,590). The

Applicants' traverse this rejection as improper for failing to teach each and every limitation as admitted by the Office.

The Cardorniga '937 patent as correctly described by the Office teaches the use of a high modulus polymer having 20-25% by weight of methacrylic acid. The Applicants' claims 24 and 25 are directed toward an ionomer having an acid level of 19%. Therefore, the cited combination of patents fails to teach each and every feature of the Applicants' claimed invention. The Cardorniga '937, Shaw '727, Molitor '590 and Shaw '252 patent fails to teach the use of a high modulus ionomer having 19% by weight of Methacrylic acid. The Applicants' respectfully request reconsideration of claims 24 and 25 as the combination fails to teach the Applicants' claimed cover properties.

Claims 26-29 are rejected as being unpatentable over Cardorniga et al. (USPN 5,415,937) in view of Shaw et al. (USPN 4,142,727) and Molitor (USPN 4,726,590) further in view of Shaw (USPN 4,877,252). The Applicants' traverse this rejection as improper for failing to teach each and every limitation as admitted by the Office.

The Cardorniga '937 patent as correctly described by the Office teaches the use of a high modulus polymer having

20-25% by weight of methacrylic acid. The Applicants' claim 26, which depends from claim 24 with an ionomer having an acid level of 19%. Therefore, the cited combination of patents fails to teach each and every feature of the Applicants' claimed invention. The Cardorniga '937, Shaw '727, Molitor '590 and Shaw '252 patent fails to teach the use of a high modulus ionomer having 19% by weight of Methacrylic acid. The Applicants' respectfully request reconsideration of claims 26-29, which depends from allowable claim 24.

VI. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the amendments to the claims be entered and all rejections be withdrawn and the application be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorusso Loud & Kelly LLP

Jeffrey D. Washville

Reg. No. 46,366

Dated: 21 JUN 04

15 Rye Street, Suite 312
Pease International Tradeport
Portsmouth, NH 03801
Tel.: (603) 427-0070
FAX: (603) 427-5530

Certificate of Mail Under 37 C.F.R. §1.8

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper along with any paper or document referred to therein as being attached or enclosed, is being transmitted via facsimile to (703) 872-9306 to the Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop AF, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450- This 21st day of June 2004.

Jeffrey D. Washville